

**HISTORIC DISTRICT COMMISSION
MINUTES OF MEETING
OCTOBER 5, 2011**

Town of Bedford
Bedford Town Hall
Selectmen's Meeting Room

PRESENT: William Moonan, Chair; Carol Carlson; Kevin Latady; Lorrie Dunham

ABSENT: Karen Kalil-Brown, Clerk; Alan Long

BUSINESS MEETING:

Mr. Moonan asked other Historic District Commission (HDC) members whether they had read the minutes of the July 6, 2011 meeting. After receiving confirmation that they had, Mr. Moonan called for a motion to approve them.

MOTION:

Ms. Carlson moved to approve the minutes of the July 6, 2011 HDC meeting, as amended.

Ms. Dunham seconded the motion.

Voting in favor: Moonan, Carlson, and Dunham

Voting against: None

Abstained: Latady

The motion carried, 3-0-1.

SPECIAL BUSINESS MEETING – 7:30 P.M. – Pamela Brown, Esq., will meet with the Commission to discuss the Notices of Determination for the Blake Block, at 68-84 Great Road.

Pamela Brown, Esq., greeted the Commission and explained that she has been meeting with the Groom Construction project team for the Blake Block, at 68-84 Great Road, and in those meetings they have come up with a list of minor changes to the plans approved by the HDC. She said she is here tonight to discuss those 12 items, which she has broken down and explained in detail in her letter to the Commission, signed and dated October 4, 2011 (see attachment).

Ms. Carlson asked whether they would be making motions for each of the items. Mr. Moonan said they wouldn't be making specific motions as such, but would simply be making determinations on whether they thought the proposed changes are major or minor, significant or insignificant.

The Commission discussed the 12 items in detail:

1. Gables, Trim Ms. Brown explained that when the original Notices of Determination for the Blake Block project were issued, Hardiplank gable boards and trim were not readily available; they have, however, become available since, so the applicants are requesting that the Commission approve Hardiplank or Azek (or equal) for the gable boards and trim, in addition to the already-approved siding.

Mr. Moonan said that his recollection of those meetings is that the Commission allowed Hardiplank siding without believing it would set a bad precedent, as it was determined that new construction in the Historic District should have different guidelines than existing structures, and non-traditional and less historic materials are permissible. Ms. Dunham asked whether there was a visible difference in the materials. Mr. Latady replied that the only way one would ever be able to tell the difference is if one walked right up to the building and stared at the siding. He said he feels this change is minor. The other members agreed.

Commission Ruling: Insignificant change

2. Trim Band Ms. Brown displayed a proposed altered elevation plan, which shows the removal of the trim band running between the first and second floor on all the elements except the brick element. Mr. Latady said he never considered this trim band to add much to the aesthetics anyway, so he has no problem considering this a minor change. The other members agreed.

Commission Ruling: Insignificant change

3. Pre-cast Base The Commission members stated that they have no issues with the foundation of the building being covered with Azek watertable (or equal) instead of a pre-cast concrete base; this was deemed insignificant.

Commission Ruling: Insignificant change

4. Element 1/Front It was determined that the panels being added below the two windows on Element 1 are not significant.

Commission Ruling: Insignificant change

5. Element 1 Balcony/Rear Ms. Brown explained that this proposed change involves moving the balcony on Element 1 Rear to the next section of the building, below the gable and over the door, to match the front elevation. The Commission members determined that this is a very minor change.

Commission Ruling: Insignificant change

6. Element 1, 2, and 4 Rear Only Awnings Ms. Brown said they would like to eliminate the awnings at the rear of the building and allow each tenant to decide whether they want to erect an awning. She said that they would, however, like to keep the awning over the entrance to the residential common area. Mr. Latady said he has no problem with eliminating the tenant awnings on the back of the building, but thinks it should be “all or nothing” – if only one or two tenants erect an awning, it may look awkward or

asymmetrical. There was discussion about the placement of the awnings. It was ultimately decided that there would be no awnings on the back of the building except for the residential common area entrance, and if any tenants want to have an awning in the rear, they will have to appear individually before the HDC at that time.

Commission Ruling: Insignificant change

7. Element 4 (Brick Front) Ms. Brown explained that the applicants hope to change the soldier course panel in brick under the upper windows to a running bond pattern, so that the windows with pre-cast heads and sills become the visual statement in the elevation. The Board talked extensively about this change and decided it was major enough to require a public hearing.

Commission Ruling: Significant change

8. Element 6 (Fletcher) Balcony Ms. Brown said that the balconies and columns on Element 6 do not fit on the approved site plan. She said an error was made during the planning process, and the element wasn't updated when the site plan was updated. Therefore, they will need to remove the balcony and the columns underneath it, but they will add a traditional door to the façade as an aesthetic touch. Mr. Moonan said that he doesn't consider this a major change, and it appears that there is nothing the HDC can do about it at this point anyway. The other members agreed.

Commission Ruling: Insignificant change

9. Element 7 East Building End Ms. Brown explained that the door on this element has been removed, along with the full balcony and columns, to allow greater space on the patio area. She said a false door has been added as an architectural feature, but it won't protrude out onto the patio, so it is more desirable. Ms. Carlson noted that a second, non-functional door may be confusing to people. There was further discussion about this change and the Board deemed that it is significant enough to require a public hearing.

Commission Ruling: Significant change

10. Element 3 Rear Windows Ms. Brown said that two windows were approved on this element, but the architect would like to add another in order to allow two windows in the residential bedroom on the second floor. Mr. Moonan pointed out that this change makes the element look a bit awkward and asymmetrical. He said that since the applicants will be returning at the next meeting to discuss some other changes, he would like to hear from the architect for this element as well. The other Commission members agreed.

Commission Ruling: Significant change

11. Element 5 (Rear) Ms. Brown stated that the architect proposes to swap the door and window locations on this element and has added a door surround to compensate for the removal of the awnings. Mr. Moonan asked why this change was necessary. Ms. Brown said the architect has stated that he feels it is necessary. Mr. Moonan said he is not necessarily opposed to this change but would like to hear from the architect as to why. After further conversation, it was decided that this item would be discussed at the next meeting as well.

Commission Ruling: Significant change

12. All Elements Railings Ms. Brown said that aluminum railings were approved for the entire Blake Block, and now they would also like to have an option to allow *either* PVC or aluminum railing systems for the structure, including rooftop screening. She explained that the PVC product was not readily available at the time of permitting; however, a PVC product is now available and the architect feels that Azek railings, or equal, will not only give a more consistent appearance to the Block, but also provide a long-lasting durable material. The Commission agreed that this was a minor change and did not require any further discussion at a future meeting.

Commission Ruling: Insignificant change

Mr. Moonan said that it appears from looking back over the list that the applicants will be returning for four items. He said that meeting will be an advertised public hearing. Ms. Brown thanked the Commission members for their time and said she would be back to see them at the next meeting in November.

MOTION:

Ms. Dunham moved to adjourn the meeting.

Ms. Carlson seconded the motion.

Voting in favor: Moonan, Carlson, Latady, and Dunham

Voting against: None

Abstained: None

The motion carried unanimously, 4-0-0.

The meeting adjourned at 9:20 PM.


William Moonan, Chairman


Date

Respectfully Submitted,

Scott Gould
HDC Assistant

Attachments:

- Cover letter from Pamela Brown, Esq., signed and dated October 4, 2011